

Appln. No. 10/821,332  
Amendment dated January 5, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed October 5, 2006

JAN 05 2007

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 36 remain in this application. Claims 31 and 33 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

**Paragraph 2 of the Office Action**

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action states that claims 3, 6 through 8, 18 through 24, 26, 27, 31 through 33, 35 and 36 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 31 into the recitation of claim 30, and therefore claim 30 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 30 (in its original form) into the recitation of claim 35, and therefore claim 35 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 30 (in its original form) into the recitation of claim 36, and therefore claim 36 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/821,332  
Amendment dated January 5, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed October 5, 2006

**Paragraph 3 and 4 of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9 through 17, 25, 28 through 39 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casden in view of Rix.

Claim 1 requires "a display adapted to display information represented by the signal". Claim 17 requires "wherein the input device includes a pointing device".

It is contended in the rejection of the Office Action that:

The main difference between the claimed invention and the teachings of the Casden reference is that the Casden reference does not expressly disclose applications/utilizations of using RFID/RF transponder as an input/output device such as a display or a pointing device of a computer arrangement. However, such undisclosed details are expressly disclosed by the Rix reference. As can be seen from the SUMMARY (Columns 1-2, & Figures 1-2, 6, 20), the Rix reference teaches the details and motivation of using RFID/RF transponder as a computer input/output device for better flexibility & convenience. In addition, in figure 6 & the respective description section, Rix teaches connecting such input/output device to HOST COMPUTER (64) as if a commonly known computer with I/O peripheral. See column 9, lines 8-62.

Clearly, any allegedly obvious modification of the Casden system to include the claimed display or pointing device would make the Casden system more complex. However, in contrast to the suggestion in the rejection of the Office Action, Casden points out that one of the problems that is sought to be solved by the system is the lack of "simpler, lower cost" systems, as set forth at col. 2, lines 29 through 31:

A continuing need exists for simpler, lower cost passive programmers, particularly for use with small or stand alone RFID installations.

In further contrast to the allegedly obvious combination, the discussion in the Casden patent is directed to providing a "simpler remote control programmer", as stated in Casden at, for example, col. 2, lines 57 through 67 (emphasis added):

Appln. No. 10/821,332

Amendment dated January 5, 2007

Reply to Office Action mailed October 5, 2006

This invention addresses the aforementioned need by providing a simpler passive remote programmer for induction type RFID readers. The novel remote programmer is of economical design, requiring only three main components: a keypad, an antenna and a number of commercially available, low cost transponder tags. Each of the transponder tags, when connected to the antenna by actuation of a key on the keypad, communicates with the RFID reader by loading down the magnetic field in the vicinity of the transmitter antenna of the reader in a pattern which the reader interprets and decodes as digital data.

In view of the above, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art, considering the disclosure of the Casden patent, would not be motivated to make the modifications suggested in the rejection by including the selected elements of the Rix, system, as this would be contrary to the desire expressed in the Casden patent to provide a "simpler" and "economical" device. As the Casden system does not disclose any need for a display, or a pointing device, modifying the Casden system to include an element that is not needed would not be obvious.

The rejection of the Office Action further alleges that:

Since both the Casden and Rix references are closely related & directed to RFID/RF transponder input device systems; furthermore, the Rix reference teaches the motivation of using RFID/RF transponder device as parts of the input devices, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the Casden reference-RFID/RF transponder detailed teachings with Rix reference-motivation of using RFID/RF transponder teachings to come up with the claimed invention for the better flexibility & convenience.

Again, it is noted from the above portions of the Casden patent that one of the purposes, if not the primary purpose, of the Casden teaching is to simplify and economize the RFID reader of the Casden system. It is not clear from the text of the rejection where the motivation comes from to add the selected elements of the Rix system to the Casden system for the purpose of "better flexibility and convenience". While flexibility and convenience are generally desirable, it is not apparent from the prior art

JAN 05 2007

Appln. No. 10/821,332  
Amendment dated January 5, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed October 5, 2006

what leads one of ordinary skill in the art to believe that these motivations are more important than the simplicity and economy objects set forth in the Casden patent.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Casden and Rix set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1, 17 and 30. Further, claims 2, 4, 9 through 13, 15 and 16 which depend from claim 1, claim 5, which depends from claim 4, claim 14, which depends from claim 13, claims 25 and 28, which depend from claim 17, claim 29, which depends from claim 28 and claim 34, which depends from claim 30 also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9 through 17, 25, 28 through 39 and 34 is therefore respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Jan 5, 2007

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. 40,158  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357